United Nations

EP

Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/GCSS.IV/3
18 July 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Fourth special session
Nairobi, 18 June 1994
Agenda item 5

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL AT ITS FOURTH SPECIAL SESSION

CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
INTRODUCTION		2
I.	ORGANIZATION OF THE SESSION	3
	A. Opening of the session	3
	B. Attendance	3
	C. Officers	4
	D. Credentials	5
	E. Agenda	5
	F. Organization of the work of the session	5
II.	ADOPTION OF THE INSTRUMENT FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A RESTRUCTURED GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY	6
III.	ADOPTION OF DECISIONS	7
IV.	ADOPTION OF THE REPORT	14
V.	CLOSURE OF THE SESSION	15

Annexes

I.	DECISION ADOPTED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL AT ITS FOURTH SPECIAL SESSION	16
II.	LIST OF DOCUMENTS BEFORE THE GOVERNING COUNCIL AT ITS FOURTH SPECIAL SESSION	17

200794

INTRODUCTION

On 9 May 1994, the Bureau of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) met to discuss the best and most expeditious way for the Council to adopt the Instrument for the Establishment of a Restructured Global Environment Facility (GEF), which had been agreed by the GEF Participants' meeting, held in Geneva from 14 to 16 March 1994. Following the Bureau meeting, the President of the Council, with the concurrence of the other members of the Bureau, and in consultation with the Executive Director of UNEP, requested that a one-day special session should be held for this purpose. In accordance with rule 5 of the rules of procedure of the Council, the Executive Director immediately informed all members of the Council of the request, as well as of the approximate costs and relevant administrative considerations, and inquired whether they concurred in it. Within 21 days of the inquiry, a majority of the members of the Council had explicitly concurred in the request. Accordingly, the Executive Director convened the fourth special session of the Council, which was held in Nairobi on 18 June 1994.

CHAPTER I

ORGANIZATION OF THE SESSION

A. Opening of the session

1. The fourth special session of the Governing Council was opened on 18 June 1994 by Mr. E.O.A. Aina (Nigeria), President of the Council.

2. The Executive Director of UNEP welcomed participants and said that the special session had been convened in accordance with rules 5, 6 and 7 of the rules of procedure of the Governing Council. In order to reduce costs, it was being held immediately prior to the second session of Intergovernmental Committee on the Convention on Biological Diversity, which was also to take place in Nairobi. At the special session, the Council was being invited to adopt the Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured Global Environment Facility (GEF) as the basis for the participation of UNEP as an implementing agency of GEF.

B. Attendance

3. The following States members of the Governing Council were represented at the session:[1]

Argentina
Australia
Bangladesh
Burundi
Canada
Chile
China
Colombia
Costa Rica
Denmark
France
Germany
Guinea
Hungary
India
Indonesia
Iran (Islamic Republic of)
Italy
Japan
Kenya
Mexico
Netherlands
Nigeria
Pakistan
Poland
Portugal
Republic of Korea
Romania
Russian Federation
Senegal
Slovakia
Spain
Sri Lanka
Sweden
Switzerland
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
United States of America
Uruguay
Venezuela
Zaire
Zambia

---

[1] The membership of the Governing Council was determined by elections held at the 35th plenary meeting of the forty-sixth session of the General Assembly, held on 22 October 1991, the 95th plenary meeting of the forty-seventh session, held on 19 January 1993, and the 54th plenary meeting of the forty-eighth session, held on 11 November 1993 (decisions 46/306, 47/318 and 48/309).

4. The following States not members of the Governing Council were represented by observers:

Algeria
Austria
Belgium
Egypt
Finland
Holy See
Israel
Kuwait
Malawi
Maldives
Mauritius
Morocco
New Zealand
Norway
Philippines
Thailand
Turkey
Uganda
United Republic of Tanzania

5. The following United Nations bodies and secretariat units were represented:

United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat) (UNCHS)
United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office

6. The following specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system were represented:

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)
International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO)
World Bank

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) was also represented.

7. The following other intergovernmental organizations were represented:

Intergovernmental Authority on Drought and Development (IGADD)
Red Sea and Gulf of Aden Environmental Programme (PERSGA) of the Arab League, Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization (ALECSO)
World Tourism Organization

8. In addition, seven international non-governmental organizations were represented by observers.

C. Officers

9. According to rule 18 of the rules of procedure of the Council, "at the commencement of the first plenary meeting of its regular session, the Governing Council shall elect a President, three Vice-Presidents and a Rapporteur from among its members". Rule 19 provides that the President, Vice-Presidents and Rapporteur shall hold office until their successors are elected (i.e. at the first meeting of the next regular session), but none of them may hold office after the expiration of the term of office of the member of whom he is a representative. Accordingly, the Bureau elected at the seventeenth regular session continued to serve at the fourth special session. The following members of the Bureau were present:

President: Mr. E.O.A. Aina (Nigeria)

Vice-President: Mr. A. Lizarralde-Maradey (Venezuela)

Rapporteur: Mr. A. Kowalewski (Poland)

D. Credentials

10. In accordance with rule 17, paragraph 2, of the rules of procedure of the Council, the Bureau examined the credentials of the representatives attending the fourth special session. The credentials were found to be in order and the President, on behalf of the Bureau, so reported to the Council, which approved the Bureau's report.

E. Agenda

11. The Council adopted the following agenda on the basis of the provisional agenda (UNEP/GCSS.IV/1), which had been circulated on 2 June 1994:

1. Opening of the session.
2. Adoption of the agenda and organization of the work of the session.
3. Credentials of representatives.
4. Adoption of the Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured Global Environment Facility.
5. Adoption of the report.
6. Closure of the session.

F. Organization of the work of the session

12. Having considered the organization of the work of the session in the light of the recommendations in the annotated provisional agenda (UNEP/GCSS.IV/1/Add.1 and Corr.1), the Council, on the proposal of the President, decided that all matters would be taken up in plenary.

CHAPTER II

ADOPTION OF THE INSTRUMENT FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A RESTRUCTURED GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY

1. In considering agenda item 4 (Adoption of the Instrument for the Establishment of a Restructured Global Environment Facility), the Council had before it a note by the Executive Director on participation of the United Nations Environment Programme in the restructured Global Environment Facility (UNEP/GCSS.IV/2), by which the Executive Director circulated to all members of the Council the Instrument for the Establishment of a Restructured Global Environment Facility. The Council also had before it suggested action by the Governing Council under the item, submitted by the Executive Director (UNEP/GCSS.IV/2/Add.1) as well as a draft decision submitted by the Committee of Permanent Representatives (UNEP/GCSS.IV/L.1, annex).

2. Introducing the item, the Executive Director said that the Global Environment Facility had been established in 1991 as a pilot programme to protect the global environment. In 1992, agreement had been reached to restructure the Facility to ensure transparency, universality, full cooperation among the implementing agencies and a new and replenished trust fund. Those principles were embodied in the Instrument before the Council, which had been agreed upon at the GEF Participants' Meeting held in Geneva from 14 to 16 March 1994. The Instrument had already been formally adopted by the governing bodies of the two other implementing agencies, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the World Bank. The Council was requested to adopt the Instrument as a whole as the basis for the participation of UNEP as an implementing agency of the Facility. Adoption of the Instrument by the Council would be a clear signal of support for the restructured GEF and for the efforts to enhance the role of UNEP as a full partner within it.

3. The Council immediately proceeded to consider and adopt, as decision SS.IV/1, the draft decision submitted by the Committee of Permanent Representatives. The text of the decision is contained in annex I to the present proceedings, and the process of adoption, including the introductory statement made by the Chairman of the Committee of Permanent Representatives and statements in explanation of positions made subsequent to the adoption of the decision, is recorded in chapter III below.

CHAPTER III

ADOPTION OF DECISIONS*

Adoption of the Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured Global Environment Facility (decision SS.IV/1)

1. At its fourth special session, on 18 June 1994, the Governing Council had before it a draft decision on this subject submitted by the Committee of Permanent Representatives (UNEP/GCSS.IV/L.1).

2. Introducing the draft decision, the representative of the Russian Federation, speaking as Chairman of the Committee of Permanent Representatives, said that the draft was the result of a compromise in the Committee that had not been easy to achieve. The issue, at first sight, might have appeared a simple one since the Instrument had already been adopted by Governments and two other implementing agencies (World Bank and UNDP). However, the Committee had analysed and discussed the Instrument in great depth. As a result, the Committee had agreed to recommend that the Council should adopt the Instrument. However, during the discussions in the Committee, many representatives expressed concern that the role of UNEP within the restructured GEF was diminished and that the tasks given to it implied that UNEP's role in decision-making was not as important as that of the other two implementing agencies. Therefore it was felt that UNEP's role in the restructured GEF had to be enhanced. The question also arose of whether UNEP was duly equipped to fulfil the tasks set out in the Instrument, especially in terms of staffing. That question had not received a clear answer in the course of the Committee's discussions. Against that background, the essence of the compromise reached in the Committee was to present to the Governing Council a draft decision consisting of three operative paragraphs: paragraph 1 approving the Instrument, paragraph 2 requesting the Executive Director to ensure UNEP's capacity to fulfil its role in GEF and paragraph 3 suggesting re-examination of the matter at the next regular session of the Governing Council. In presenting the draft, the Chairman of the Committee of Permanent Representatives was asked to describe the discussion in the Committee and to inform the Governing Council that the Committee of Permanent Representatives would continue to keep the matter under review. In conclusion, he expressed the hope that the draft decision before the Governing Council could be adopted by consensus.

3. The draft decision was adopted by consensus.

4. Following the adoption of the decision, a number of representatives made statements in explanation of position.

5. The representative of Japan said that UNEP, as the principal organ in the United Nations system in the field of the environment had been playing a leading role in constructing an international framework to address global environmental problems. Japan had a high opinion of UNEP's achievements since its establishment. Noting that, at the second substantive session of the Commission on Sustainable Development, a number of countries expressed high expectations for the role to be played by UNEP in such important areas as trade and environment and technology transfer, he said that he was pleased to see the Programme had already taken positive initiatives in response to those newly emerging issues. He hoped that UNEP would continue

---

* For the text of the decision adopted by the Governing Council at its fourth special session, see annex I to the present proceedings.

to play a major role in the follow-up to the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED). It was Japan's intention to cooperate with relevant international organizations such as UNEP to ensure the steady implementation of the agreements adopted at the UNCED. Turning to the issue of technology transfer to developing countries, which, along with financial resources, was crucially important in addressing global environmental problems, he said that, as host country, Japan would provide cooperation to the recently inaugurated UNEP International Environmental Technology Centre to ensure its smooth functioning. With regard to the restructured Global Environment Facility (GEF), he said that Japan had supported GEF from the start of its pilot phase since it was convinced that it should play an important role as the central mechanism for mobilizing financial resources to address global environmental problems. His Government attached great importance to financial issues for the implementation of the UNCED agreements and welcomed the conclusion of the negotiations on the restructuring and replenishment of GEF. Believing that its international contributions should be commensurate with its position in the international community, Japan had decided to make a financial contribution of about 20 per cent of the core fund of GEF-II. Finally, he expressed the hope that the restructured GEF would start its activities in a smooth way and that it would use its funds effectively and efficiently.

6. The observer for Algeria, speaking as Chairman of the Group of 77 and China, said that the fourth special session of the Governing Council was the climax of more than two years of difficult negotiations, the results of which testified to the correctness of the stance held from the outset by the Group of 77 and China on the need to make structural changes in the pilot phase of GEF. For the developing countries, the question of funding the obligations undertaken during the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development was of vital importance. The question could make or break the work initiated at the Earth Summit to achieve sustainable development equitably shared by all. The question of new and additional financial resources for developing countries to enable them to meet their commitments with respect to environmental protection and development was a sina qua non for the emergence of a global partnership, symbolized by the spirit of Rio. Nevertheless, the Rio spirit was slow in becoming the reality of daily experience, as could be seen from the recent session of the Commission on Sustainable Development. The developing countries therefore attached great importance to the negotiations on restructuring GEF, which was supposed to constitute the global funding mechanism for the implementation of Agenda 21. At the end of those negotiations, the Group of 77 and China noted with great satisfaction the accommodation of their essential concerns relating to universal participation of the community of nations on an equal footing in the new GEF. The Group of 77 and China believed that the basic principle of universality must be accompanied by a democratization of management and operational rules. In that respect, the results were still below their hopes and expectations. Similarly, the amount of funding provided under the mechanism was far from the estimated financial requirements to implement Agenda 21 for the period 1993-2000. However, since the Instrument represented a compromise and a delicate balance, it could be neither perfect nor ideal. It did, nevertheless, open the way for progress by pointing to the direction to be followed in the years to come. The effective involvement of the conferences of the parties to the conventions signed or initiated at UNCED, was the best way to perfect the results achieved during those negotiations. In that respect, the forthcoming second session of the Intergovernmental Committee on the Convention on Biological Diversity provided, under its agenda items relating to resources and the financial mechanism, the proper occasion for such involvement. To that end, full cooperation could counted on from the Group of 77 and China, which, he was convinced, would assume their share of responsibility.

7. The representative of India said that the Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured GEF was not a perfect document and had shortcomings. It restricted GEF's role to a small corner of the vast field of the environment. Also, it granted to GEF an amount of money which was hopelessly inadequate for the role which it had been asked to play in financing environmental measures in the four focal areas, areas in which all had accepted far-reaching and costly commitments. India nevertheless welcomed the establishment of the restructured GEF as a first serious step by the international community in pursuit of sustainable development and had offered to increase its contribution to the replenished GEF. Concerning the partnership of UNEP in GEF, his Government had serious misgivings. For over two decades, UNEP had been accepted by the international community as the principal United Nations body in environmental matters. That status and role had been pointedly reaffirmed in Agenda 21. It was the responsibility of UNEP to identify all major threats to the environment, to evolve strategies to counter them, to create programmes to implement the strategies and even to execute projects in special cases. UNEP must think globally, even when acting regionally or nationally. It must keep in mind existing international conventions, agreements and understandings, even while proposing new approaches, and must give the lead in cooperation and coordination among international organizations, national institutions, NGOs and the world scientific community. There would have been no GEF but for UNEP. Therefore, the least that was expected of UNEP in a restructured GEF was an equal partnership with the other two organizations, the World Bank and UNDP. The text in the Instrument outlining UNEP's assigned role gave a clear feeling that UNEP had not done enough during the restructuring process to protect its role, let alone enhance it, and had thus let down the cause of sustainable development. Although the text of the Instrument did not bar UNEP from playing a strategic role, that same text did not enable UNEP to play that role. Was UNEP afraid that it did not have the capacity to do all that it must in a restructured GEF? If that were so, then clearly UNEP must be urged to develop that capacity. It was to be recalled that the Governing Council at its last session had specifically requested the Executive Director to strengthen the role of UNEP as a full partner in the restructured GEF. Regarding STAP, the organ through which UNEP was given a role to play in the restructured GEF, he wished to reiterate the call made at the last session of the Governing Council that there should be transparency in the selection of the STAP members. India wished to have details of how UNEP intended to ensure that, and to have UNEP's views on its role vis á vis STAP. In addition, he wished to draw the Executive Director's attention to the Governing Council decision whereby the financing of Agenda 21 programmes be considered under GEF, where the mandate of GEF and the programme areas of the restructured GEF so permitted. In conclusion, he expressed India's support for UNEP's participation in the restructured GEF, as proposed.

8. The representative of Australia said that his Government supported the adoption of the Instrument without reservation. The adoption of the Instrument meant that UNEP would fulfil the role identified for it, namely, in the areas of particular emphasis identified in paragraph 11 of annex D. Drawing particular attention to paragraph 11 (d) of annex D, he said that that sentence meant that UNEP would be involved in the whole range of GEF-financed activities, whether global, regional and national, and in international environmental agreements. It also meant that UNEP should be active on strategic issues as well as in providing technical inputs. The third sentence of that paragraph meant that UNEP would be responsible for establishing and supporting STAP. However, he had the impression that UNEP's capacity to fulfil its role was distinctly undeveloped. That was the point of paragraph 2 of the decision SS.IV/1. Australia believed that UNEP must move quickly to set up an effective unit within its organizational structure, to give it an adequate, managerially competent

and technically expert staff, and, if need be, to resort to short-term expedients in order to do so. Laying particular emphasis on the urgency of such action, he said that UNEP must move quickly to establish arrangements, including standing liaison arrangements, for collaboration with the two implementing agencies and the GEF secretariat, which would include authoritative participation in the Inter-Agency Committee at both the high-level representative and staff levels. Finally, he stressed that Australia was not advocating a competitive relationship among the implementing agencies but rather was committed to a cooperative relationship in which each agency would discharge its assigned role.

9. The representative of Venezuela said that his delegation considered that it was very important for agreement to have been reached on the Instrument by the Governing Council. Venezuela did, however, share the concerns expressed by other representatives that the role allocated to UNEP in the Instrument was less than its role in the pilot phase. Nevertheless, his delegation was convinced that it was possible for UNEP to play an important role in the Facility if it substantially improved its performance compared to what it had done under the pilot phase. It was therefore important to highlight the task given to UNEP of providing guidance on relating the GEF-financed activities to global, regional and national environmental assessments, policy frameworks and plans. Through such guidance, UNEP would be able to channel a far greater quantity of funds than its own resources towards activities related to its own programme. He therefore urged the Executive Director to step up efforts for UNEP to fulfil adequately the mandate that it had been given.

10. The representative of Sweden said her Government welcomed the approval and adoption of the Instrument by the Council. UNEP had a spearhead role to play as one of the senior partners in that important financial mechanism for cooperation between countries committed to halting global environmental degradation and supporting sustainable development. UNEP's participation in the pilot phase of GEF had been favourably commented on in the independent evaluation exercise. The limited staff directly involved in coordinating UNEP's activities with those of the other implementing agencies and in supporting STAP had done remarkably well. UNEP now had to provide strategic scientific and technological guidance and support to all GEF activities. The role and functions of a new STAP, including its relations with those international conventions utilizing GEF as their major financial mechanism, had to be clear and efficiently performed. Under a fully operational GEF-umbrella, UNEP obviously needed a capacity to match its partners, in order to discharge its major tasks. Everyone knew what constraints were already placed on the finances of UNEP. Therefore, it was some relief to learn that the additional capacity needed in UNEP would be financed by GEF. That was in order to complement the critically important UNEP capacity and expertise in place, whose experience and capability, she trusted, could be fully utilized. UNEP's work for and within GEF was an integral part of UNEP's overall mandate to work for sustainable development, and she looked forward to a visible UNEP presence in GEF. Sweden's approval of the GEF Instrument on the part of UNEP, she concluded, was based on great expectations. The Instrument was there and the challenge must be met.

11. The representative of the Republic of Korea said that he appreciated the role that UNEP had played in GEF to date. He firmly believed that UNEP would continue to strengthen its leadership role and said that his Government fully concurred with the Instrument that had been adopted. In that connection, his Government had decided to make a financial contribution to GEF for the period 1994-1997 and had already deposited a notification of participation with the GEF secretariat. At the present juncture of GEF's development, he hoped that the restructuring would be successful in such a way that UNEP's priority areas would be reflected to

the fullest extent in the GEF projects and that STAP would be truly independent to exercise its role and function. He concluded by expressing the firm belief that, only when UNEP's voice was effective in determining the focus of GEF's functions, would GEF be able to achieve its purpose of having a real impact of global environmental protection.

12. The representative of Burundi said that his delegation supported decision SS.IV/1 and the idea of clearly defining the role of UNEP in the restructured GEF with a view to better achieving sustainable development as set out in Agenda 21. He noted that the recent political situation in his country and its neighbour, Rwanda, and the resultant movements of refugees had led to negative environmental consequences, in particular, in the form of deforestation, soil degradation, deterioration of parks and national reserves, and fresh water pollution. His delegation called on GEF to provide an emergency fund for the reconstruction of those threatened environments. In that connection, it was important to stress the essential role of the mountain forest of Kebera in the Zaire-Nile divide and its continuation in Rwanda under the name Nyongwe forest, in acting as a water catchment for the Zaire and Nile basins. Given the importance and the role of that ecosystem, his delegation suggested that GEF should make available financial resources to protect it in the interests of the region.

13. The representative of Chile said that his delegation endorsed the statements that had been made by previous speakers, particularly the representatives of India and Venezuela. He recalled that at previous sessions of the Governing Council, his country had pointed to the need to strengthen the role of UNEP in GEF. He stressed that UNEP must employ initiative and effective practical actions to make use of the options given to it by the Instrument.

14. The representative of China said his Government was very pleased that the Governing Council had adopted the Instrument. Although not perfect, the Instrument represented a marked improvement over the original version and his Government agreed to its acceptance, which marked a great step forward in the field of the environment. Although the three implementing agencies would do their utmost to implement GEF, they each had different priorities and expertise. UNEP's major role was to promote and encourage scientific and technical analysis, as well as environmental management activities funded by GEF. Over the past years, UNEP had played an essential role in implementing GEF activities. That role had to be enhanced. He fully supported the inclusion in the agenda of the next Governing Council session of an item on UNEP's participation in GEF. STAP, he continued, had played an active role in the pilot phase of GEF and he hoped to see its role in project evaluation, identification, and screening further strengthened. China believed that, during the pilot phase, project formulation and approval had been a complex and time-consuming process. GEF had not been perfect and had been undergoing a process of fine tuning at that stage. With the adoption of the Instrument and its implementation, he hoped that the process of project formulation and approval would become more rational and efficient. In conclusion, he said China believed that the four priority funding areas identified for GEF were appropriate. China also believed that, like land degradation, projects related to the Basel Convention on Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal were closely linked with the four areas mentioned. As such projects had a more urgent nature for the developing countries, they should also be eligible for funding.

15. The observer for the Philippines paid tribute to the President, the Bureau and the secretariat for the efficient way in which the session had been organized. He said that a number of questions concerning the adopted Instrument had been raised, but those questions had reinforced the wisdom of what the Council had adopted. He said his Government was happy with the decision that had been adopted by the Governing Council and fully supported it.

16. The representative of Romania said that his country had developed fruitful relations with UNEP and had benefited from its assistance. He hoped that UNEP's role as an equal partner within the newly restructured GEF would be enhanced. That would be favourable for the continuation of his country's national and international programmes regarding the Danube and the Black Sea. Romania had also been actively involved with UNEP in undertaking to fulfil local programmes and desired to benefit further from the facilities and cooperation provided with GEF-II. In that respect, his delegation had been mandated to support the restructuring of the pilot phase of GEF and to sign up for participation in GEF-II. Although Romania was not in a position to contribute in terms of funding, it could contribute in kind through the provision of expertise.

17. The representative of the United States of America said that decision SS.IV/1 was both balanced and judicious. On the one hand, it made for a clear accession by UNEP to the Instrument, an agreement which had hailed as an historic opportunity to build the North-South partnerships indispensable to well-being of the planet. On the other hand, the decision was an expression of the Governing Council's desire to see that UNEP's authority and expertise were properly asserted in matters of sustainable development. His delegation believed that, in essence, that boiled down to the issue of how effectively UNEP could bring to bear much of what it was already doing within the context of GEF. His delegation also believed that, at its next session, the Governing Council could and should give its view to the Executive Director on whether UNEP's efforts, in the context of its 1994-1995 work programme were or were not effective. For the moment, however, it would be premature to make any solid judgement on UNEP's effectiveness within GEF. With the decision just adopted by the Governing Council, with the three implementing partners just beginning to work out their respective roles, and with the GEF Council to meet in July 1994 to take up critical issues, including some referred to at the current special session of the Governing Council, there was a need to keep an open mind.

18. The representative of Kenya said that his Government attached a premium to the role and place of the restructured GEF as the institutional structure to operate the financial mechanism under the Convention on Biological Diversity. As much as Kenya supported the idea of the adoption of GEF as that structure, it wished to see a formulation of two or more parallel funding mechanisms to include not only GEF-II, but also a new Biodiversity Fund under the Convention that would attract donations and contributions from the wider community and bilateral aid contributions from Governments. That Fund should be controlled directly by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention. Kenya also wished to see UNEP and STAP secure a stronger role than was given in the Instrument, and believed that the Governing Council should carve out a role for UNEP as the leading GEF agency. Concerning the relationship between UNEP and the proposed GEF Council, Kenya would like UNEP to provide strategic guidance and advice directly to the GEF Council, and not through the GEF secretariat, on policies, strategies, priorities and other operational guidelines as they related to environmental issues. STAP, on the other hand, should provide formal recommendations on project priorities and on scientific and technical quality to the Conference of the Parties, through the Interim Secretariat, and subsequently to the GEF Council for project acceptance. Alternatively, the Inter-Agency Committee and not the World Bank-controlled GEF secretariat should have the power to determine which projects should go through for funding consideration by the Council and to decide what advice should be given to the Council. In conclusion, he said that Kenya wished to see the appointment of staff for the restructured GEF addressed immediately. In addition, he wanted the participation of UNEP to be discussed fully by the Governing Council at its next session.

19. The representative of Thailand joined previous representatives from the Group of 77 and in welcoming and supporting the adoption of the Instrument and the draft decision by consensus. His delegation sincerely believed that the recently completed restructuring would provide more funds to projects dealing with global environmental problems. Thailand was of the view that, in the long run, the Global Environment Facility should be expanded to cover regional as well as national projects. While pleased to hear that the States participating in GEF had committed about $2 billion to contribute to the Facility between June 1994 and June 1997, Thailand did feel that the funds committed to date were still below expectations compared with the tasks that had to be addressed in the years to come. He therefore urged the donor countries to provide more funds to the Facility. In conclusion, he said that his Government was seriously considering whether to become a participant in GEF in the near future.

CHAPTER IV

ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

1. At its fourth special session, on 18 June, the Council had before it an outline draft report on the work of the session, circulated as document UNEP/GCSS.IV/L.2.

2. The Council decided to authorize the Rapporteur, in consultation with the President and with the assistance of the secretariat, to finalize the report for submission to the General Assembly at its forty-ninth session, through the Economic and Social Council. The present proceedings have been prepared on the basis of that final report.

CHAPTER V

CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

Following the customary exchange of courtesies, the President declared the fourth special session of the Governing Council closed at 12.30 p.m. on 18 June 1994.

Annex I

DECISION ADOPTED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL AT ITS FOURTH SPECIAL SESSION

SS.IV/1. Adoption of the Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured Global Environment facility

The Governing Council,

Having taken note of the agreement reached at the Global Environment Facility Participants' meeting held in Geneva from 14 to 16 March 1994 on the text of the Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured Global Environment Facility,

Having studied the text of the Instrument transmitted to the Council by a note by the Executive Director a/ and, in particular, the description of the role of United Nations Environment Programme as set out in annex D, section II, paragraph 11 (b), of the Instrument,

1. Adopts the Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured Global Environment Facility, as a basis for the participation of the United Nations Environment Programme as an implementing agency of the Global Environment Facility;

2. Requests the Executive Director to consider ways of enhancing the capacity of the United Nations Environment Programme to fulfil its role in the Global Environment Facility;

3. Further requests the Executive Director to include in the provisional agenda for the eighteenth regular session of the Council an item on the participation of the United Nations Environment Programme in the Global Environment Facility and to present a progress report to the Council thereon.

18 June 1994

---

a/ UNEP/GCSS.IV/2, annex.

Annex II

LIST OF DOCUMENTS BEFORE THE GOVERNING COUNCIL AT ITS FOURTH SPECIAL SESSION

Symbol	Title
UNEP/GCSS.IV/1	Provisional agenda for the fourth special session of the Governing Council
UNEP/GCSS.IV/1/Add.1 and Corr.1	Annotated provisional agenda and organization of the work of the session
UNEP/GCSS.IV/2	Adoption of the Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured Global Environment Facility. Participation of the United Nations Environment Programme in the restructured Global Environment Facility. Note by the Executive Director
UNEP/GCSS.IV/2/Add.1	Suggested action by the Governing Council
UNEP/GCSS.IV/L.1	Adoption of the Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured Global Environment Facility. Draft decision submitted by the Committee of Permanent Representatives. Note by the Executive Director

---